

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4, and 8-20 are pending. Applicants have carefully considered the Final Action in this Application, dated June 1, 2007. Applicants present the above amendments and following remarks in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Applicants have amended Claims 4, 8, 10, 12, and 18, in this Response. Claims 11-20 have been determined by the Examiner to be in condition for allowance. Applicants thank the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in light of the above amendments and the following remarks for Claims 1-2, 4, and 8-10.

Claims 4, 8, 10, 12, and 18 stand objected by the Examiner. Applicants thank the Examiner for his suggestions and have corrected the identified Claims accordingly. Applicants further contend that the rationale underlying these non-narrowing amendments bears no more than a tangential relation to any equivalence in question because the non-narrowing amendments are only directed to typographical errors easily identifiable as such by a person of skill in the art. *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 122 S.Ct. 1831 (2002).

Claims 1-2, 4, and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,274 to Lee (“Lee”). In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 1, as now amended, more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, “verifying halting of said program in said supplemental processor; storing said register states in said main memory; accessing said register state by said first processor; subsequent to storing said register states and accessing said register states, inspecting said register states for errors; and restoring operation of said program in

said supplemental processor.” (Emphasis added.) Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, page 6, lines 13-15, FIGS. 2 and 3, and Claim 3, of the original Application.

Regarding Claim 1, Lee was cited as assertedly fully disclosing a method for use in a computer system having a main memory and a first processor, the method providing said first processor with access to the register state of a supplemental processor, said supplemental processor otherwise inaccessible by said first processor, the method comprising: (1) loading a program into said supplemental processor; (2) executing said program in said supplementary processor to generate said register states of said supplementary processor; (3) storing said register state in said main memory; (4) accessing said register state by said first processor; and (4) subsequent to storing said register states and accessing said register states, inspecting said register states for errors.

However, as admitted by the Examiner, the cited references do not verify the halting of the supplemental processor nor do they restart the supplemental processor. In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that Lee does not anticipate the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Lee be withdrawn, and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Lee. Claim 2 depends from and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 1 also be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Lee. Applicants contend that the rejections of amended Claims 4 and 8-10 are overcome for at least some of the reasons that the

rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include Lee not disclosing, teaching, or suggesting the verifying of the cessation, halting, or interruption of the operation of the program. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 4 and 8-10 are clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for full allowance. Therefore, for at least the reasons above and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee fails to anticipate each and every element as recited in the Claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request full allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-10 in addition to the previously allowed Claims 11-20.

Applicants believe no additional fees are due in this Response. In the event that any other fees are due, Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 of IBM Corporation.

Applicants believe that the present Response contains a complete response to the issues raised in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request full reconsideration of the Claims not previously considered in a condition for allowance. If the Examiner should have any questions, comments or suggestions, the undersigned attorney earnestly requests a telephone conference. In particular, should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: August 21, 2007
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093